

Return on Investment (ROI) Program Funding Application

This template was built using the ITD ROI Submission Intranet application.

FINAL AUDIT REQUIRED: The Enterprise Quality Assurance Office of the Information Technology Department is required to perform post implementation outcome audits for all Pooled Technology funded projects and may perform audits on other projects.

This is a Pooled Technology Fund Request. Amount of funding requested: \$250,000.00

Section I: Proposal

| | |
|---|---|
| Date: | 6/29/2004 |
| Agency Name: | Parole Board |
| Project Name: | IPAROLE-ICON Integration Project |
| Agency Manager: | Clarence Key |
| Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail: | (515)242-5752 / clarence.key@ibop.state.ia.us |
| Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee): | Richard Bordwell |

A. Project Summary

Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

Response:

This proposal is for integration of the Iowa Corrections Offender Network (ICON) and Iowa Parole Automated Records On Line (IPAROLE) data systems used by Iowa Corrections and Iowa Board of Parole to improve the efficiency of releasing inmates from prison once the Board of Parole (BOP) approves a work release or parole. This will be accomplished by allowing BOP to issue Electronic Orders with secure signatures, electronically storing and retrieving necessary documents. The revocation part of the plan would allow parole officers (POs) to make Preliminary Parole Violation Information (PPVI) electronically with the Iowa District Court and with BOP. Parole Revocation Orders would be issued electronically and certificates of service entered electrically. The goal is to both reduce the time waiting for paperwork to pass through the system so that prisoners can be moved out of prison faster and improve the efficiency by reducing duplicate data entry. Documents received by BOP would be received electronically or scanned if received on paper, filed and retrieved electronically. The proposal also calls for judges and county attorneys and members of the public to enter letters of recommendation into the IPAROLE database via the internet. Victim registration will be entered "on line" by county attorneys and BOP and DOC victim registration can be combined even though they have different statutory standards. The release decisions made by BOP and captured in IPAROLE will be sent to a BOP web site where they may be viewed by the public after the offender is advised of the decision. This will be accomplished by additional computer programming in both ICON and IPAROLE and will require efforts by DOC and BOP to work with developers to create the new system. The cost of the developing the system is projected to be \$300,000. **COST SAVINGS POTENTIAL:** This proposal has the potential to generate significant on-going savings to the State of Iowa by speeding up the release of inmates approved for parole. Preliminary figures from CJJP indicate the BOP authorized release 2,849 prisoners who went to parole with supervision in Iowa during FY03. During the same period, 201 were discharged early by the BOP. If the average time from release authorization to the date the parolee walks out of prison can be reduced by 6 days through this program, we could empty the equivalent of more than 50 Iowa prison beds. With the current cost of one prison bed at \$60.41 per day, the total savings would be in excess of One million dollars ANNUALLY. Cost savings for the parole revocation system would be the reduction in staff input time of approximately 1/2 time or \$7,000 annually. This person could then be reassigned to do risk calculations, which have fallen behind in recent

years. Savings in the direct input of judge, county attorney and public letters of recommendation will result in less staff handling of mail and entry of summaries of letters into the IPAROLE computer system. This savings is estimated at ¼ time data entry person at an annual cost savings of \$4,000. Additional benefits would be accuracy of information would be improved by having the originator type of the data and the information can be gathered and presented to Parole Board members in a uniform layout. This will improve the efficiency of Board reviews.

B. Strategic Plan

How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

Response:

The primary activity of the Board of Parole is the selection of the best candidates for release from prison and returning to prison those who violate their release conditions and pose a risk to the public. This proposal is a part of the strategic plan of BOP.

C. Current Technology

Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction?

Response:

Currently the BOP has a stand-alone SQL database which receives information from ICON and ACIS computers nightly and also sends ICON parole information at night. A year ago the current parole SQL database was duplicated in a new system called IPAROLE, which will be activated in October 2004 when ACIS will be shut down. IPAROLE is run on the same server as ICON and the two systems will share data on a near-real-time basis with Corrections and BOP maintaining control of their own functions. BOP currently maintains a web site where decisions are posted at the end of the month. The present web site only displays the decisions for one month.

D. Statutory or Other Requirements

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?

☐ YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Explanation:

Crime Identification Technology Act, Public Law 105-251.

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?

☐ YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is

impacted by it.)

Explanation:

Language contained in Code of Iowa 904, 906 and 908.

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?

☒ YES (If "YES", explain.)

Explanation:

All decisions made by BOP involve decisions on the safety and security of the public and many times victims of crime. The improvements proposed will help track and present this safety and security information for BOP decisions.

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?

☐ YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

Explanation:

BOP is striving to reach all standards: database, operating system, and web based technology.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (20 Points Maximum)

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-20 points awarded.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens

a. Project Participants

List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

Response:

The primary stakeholders are the Governor, Legislature, Board of Parole Chair and board members, Director of Corrections, Corrections' staff, and Community Based Corrections Directors and their staff who will have accurate data with which to implement or redirect programs and staff to achieve the overall goal of safe communities. This is crucial so that communities are safe and that corrections resources can be invested wisely without waste. The nature of participants responsibilities are to provide input, review, and overall mission statements.

- An equally important stakeholder is the offender being considered for parole or work release and offenders who are under supervision. These offenders deserve a chance at success in life and not endless opportunities to see the inside of a jail or prison.
- Citizens may inform themselves of BOP decisions through the internet.
- CJJP will have accurate offender data on which to recommend policy changes.
- The staff of all public safety agencies need to know accurate and up-to-date information on the person they are dealing with.
- The general public needs to live in safe communities.
- Legislatures and policy makers need to know what works, what doesn't, and how to make improvements.

b. Service Improvements

Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

Response:

The ability to issue electronic parole and work release orders and agreements will avoid the "paper chase" of waiting for documents to be printed at BOP, mail time to prison and then having prison mail documents to Community Based Corrections (CBC) parole officers who now investigate the parole residence only after

receiving the paper "packet." The approving order and agreement will be electronically available on the date issued by both the prison staff and CBC parole officers. This will mean less time waiting for approval of parole plans and faster movement into the community, thus helping with management of prison overcrowding.

Direct entry of letters of recommendation will make the process more convenient for judges and county attorneys as well as offender's family and friends. On line victim registration by county attorneys will speed the BOP victim registration process and coordinate it with DOC victim registration (the statutory standards being different for DOC and BOP) while at the same time reducing the potential for errors through duplicate data entry. It will also greatly enhance work process and reduce duplicate data entry by Board of Parole staff. IPAROLE data is critical to information loaded on the Enterprise Data Warehouse and will be the cornerstone of the Criminal Justice Information Systems Integration (CJIS) project. Multiple justice agencies will have the opportunity to access some of the data in a secure environment. The IPAROLE data from the Enterprise Data Warehouse is used to create annual statistical reports which is reducing staff time required to generate the reports. Additionally, linking IPAROLE data on parole revocations and eventually filing the documents electronically with the Court will result in a staff time savings for CBCs and the Courts.

c. Citizen Impact

Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adopted rate of Iowa's citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

Response:

Citizens can inform themselves of BOP decisions through the internet web site. Citizens will also be able to provide direct input to BOP through the web site.

d. Public Health and/or Safety

Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

Response:

The health and safety of the public will be improved by providing the best information possible to BOP members who are considering the release of prisoners and by the prompt and fair resolution of applications to revoke parole and by promptly posting the results of revocation hearings.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimally improves Customer Service (0-3 points).
- Moderately improves Customer Service (4-6 points).
- Significantly improves Customer Service (7-10 points).

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).
- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).
- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).

F. Process Reengineering

Provide a pre-project or pre-expenditure (before implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

Response:

Pre-project process:

Parole and Work Release Orders and Agreements. When a parole or work release is approved by the BOP board members, a BOP staff member will enter the decision code into IPAROLE and then print the Orders authorizing the release and the Parole or Work Release agreement are then mailed to the institution holding the inmate. At this time DOC is preparing a temporary CBC Work Release agreement but there have been problems because the special conditions imposed by BOP have not been included in the temporary CBC generated Work Release Agreement signed by the offender. At the institution the mail is received in the mail room and routed to the appropriate staff person. For inmates going to parole, the inmate sign the Parole Agreement and it, along with other documents, will be forwarded by mail to the CBC for the parole officer (PO) to investigate the parole plan, including a visit to the proposed residence. After the CBC approves the parole plan the offender will be released from prison and told to report to the parole officer. At the first meeting the PO will have the offender sign the parole agreement again, often with additional conditions imposed by the PO. Work release documents are sent to the receiving work release facility. At this time BOP has no ability to review offender signed parole and work release agreements from within IPAROLE nor does BOP maintain a paper copy of such signed documents.

Parole Revocation Applications. Individual parole violation reports are now entered in ICON by parole officers (PO) as they occur. The parole revocation process is implemented by the PO he or she drafts a Preliminary Parole Violation Information (PPVI), which is generated and printed in ICON. The PPVI is printed and filed with the Court, and a copy is sent to BOP, along with paper copies of the Violation Reports which support the alleged violation. Under the present system the PO electronically sends unsigned copies of the PPVI and Violation Report in Word format attached to an email to the BOP where they are printed and used at hearing then filed in the inmate paper file. When the magistrate or judge finds probable cause to believe a violation has occurred, the PO will send to BOP a copy of the finding and a parole revocation case is entered in the IPAROLE database to track the scheduling of that case before the BOP Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), the filing of various documents in the case, the issuing of subpoenas and the ALJ decision. In some cases the PO will recommend that the case be continued upon the good behavior of the parolee. In some cases the parolee will ask that parole be terminated in the absence of a violation. There are also "automatic revocation" cases where a parolee is convicted and sentenced on a felony or aggravated misdemeanor. In all of these cases each step is now documented on paper and the information from the paper is entered into the BOP database by BOP staff members. ALJ decisions are mostly made on preprinted forms by use of check boxes with a few fill-in-the-blank entries and are faxed to the jail holding the offender and to the receiving institution when there is a revocation. Often the data entry is several weeks to several months following the action taken. This delay in data entry means that the IPAROLE data can not be relied upon by BOP board members as being current and the reasons for revocations, which are not now posted to the computer database, must be obtained from a review of the paper file.

Appeals from the ALJ decisions must be made within 10 days and are to the Chair. The IPAROLE system will track the date an appeal is filed and the date and decision on appeal, however it has no method of tracking or reporting on those cases to follow the undecided appeals and there is no work-flow reminder directed to the Chair to schedule the consideration of appeals. BOP staff member maintains a paper list of all ALJ appeals filed by entering the offender name and number, date of decision, date appeal filed, date of decision on appeal and the decision.

Victim Registration. BOP registered victims are registered by the prosecuting county attorneys submitting written forms to BOP identifying the offender and victim, including contact information. Upon receipt of a registration BOP staff member notes "Pending Victim" in IPAROLE to indicate that a BOP registration is in process. After the BOP staff reviews the crime and confirms that the victim meets statutory requirements each victim of a crime is confirmed as a BOP registered victim. BOP registered victims are automatically sent copies of the results of each case review and they are given written notice by mail of inmate interviews. No inmate with a registered victim can be released before discharge date unless the BOP registered victim is given 20 days advance notice and an opportunity to be heard by the BOP. DOC has lower statutory requirements for registration of victims and DOC accepts all county attorney victim notifications. The county attorneys normally use the same paper victim registration form to notify BOP and DOC.

Recommendation Letters. Trial judges and county attorneys are required by law to send letters of recommendation to the BOP, Iowa Code section 901.9. Presently less than 10% of prisoners receive these recommendations. In an effort to improve the quality of information available to the BOP for decision making, an effort is being made to encourage trial judges and county attorneys to provide recommendations. These letters and those from victims are entered into IPAROLE or if they are long, they are summarized by BOP staff. In this manner they are made available to BOP board members on the "dockets." Notations of other support and opposition letters are also entered by BOP staff. When correspondence is received by email there is no way to electronically file the documents so they will be printed and placed in the paper file in the same manner as postal letters. BOP staff also enter codes in IPAROLE to indicate to whom letters are sent within the BOP office for action. When BOP staff or board members take action they will either type out a letter, fax or mail it, or if a phone call is involved, make hand written notes of the conversation. In all cases a copy will be placed in the basket to be filed and a BOP clerk will later place the document(s) in the paper file. On some occasions the authoring board member or a staff member will summarize the action taken in IPAROLE.

Receipt of Criminal History Information. At the present time, BOP receives paper copies of Department of Criminal Investigation (DCI) criminal history reports, FBI criminal history reports to use in calculating the BOP risk to reoffend. Presentence reports made by CBCs and Reception Reports made by DOC are also routinely used in the BOP risk calculation. Most of the recent pre sentence reports and reception reports are now received electronically but because there is no method to store the information with an index to the offender, the files are printed and placed in the offender's paper file.

BOP Work Flow and Electronic Files. Currently BOP has no ability to convert any paper documents to

electronic format. Presentence reports and receptions reports can be viewed and printed from IPAROLE. Correspondence work-flow is now limited to staff members making a note of the person to whom correspondence was referred to for reply. The major work-flow now in use is the scheduling of annual reviews of some seven thousand inmates for release consideration. Each inmate is given an annual interview date at the appropriate time in their sentence. The month prior to the review date, the file is reviewed by the board. If an interview is not denied, the inmate is scheduled for an interview the next month the board holds interviews at that institution. The IPAROLE system generates an alphabetical list of inmates to be interviewed at each institution. DOC and BOP staff exchange email about scheduling and someone types a list of interviewees in the interview order, which is usually by councilor, but there are exceptions for inmates with visitors and with victims. During interviews one of the board members keeps track of the most restrictive vote which is considered the vote of the board. If the BOP risk is 7,8 or 9, an "F-9" sheet is prepared listing the vote of each member as well as the date, inmate name, number, institution and the BOP risk score. Even though all information is known in advance except the vote, one board member is required to complete this form on all high-risk candidates if the three-member panel recommends any release. This clerical work preformed by the BOP board member detracts from that member participating in the interview. In the past when there was adequate BOP staff support this clerical function was handled by staff.

Each time the BOP holds interviews at an institution the DOC staff has the opportunity to recommend release of offenders not on the interview list. Depending on the history of each case the BOP board members may grant a release, recommend a release to other board members in "F-9" cases, deny a release or schedule the offender for an interview at a later session. Offenders with violent backgrounds are frequently interviewed. The BOP staff prints one docket for all staff initiated cases to be considered. In order to assemble the "staff initiated" list the counselors email BOP staff requesting each inmate be added to the staff list. Sometimes the reason and recommendation is stated in the email. The email is printed and placed in the paper file and taken to the institution for the BOP board members to review with the staff. A hand typed list of offenders is also sent with the files for recording each BOP board member's vote. This is in addition to recording the vote on the single docket, or in the case where the offender has prior multiple dockets, to recording on the individual dockets. As the list of prisoners being interviewed has grown in recent months, the "staff initiated" list has been submitted in advance of the interview date for the BOP board members to consider which inmates need to be interviewed in person. These files are then scheduled for interview at an interview session for that institution.

IPAROLE DOCKETS. Currently IPAROLE dockets are the forms which summarize offender information in a useful way for BOP board decisions and to provide staff with information. The dockets can either be viewed on screen or can be printed individually or in "books." BOP board members write their votes on the paper dockets which are placed in the paper files. BOP members and staff may make notes on the correspondence section of the dockets but this has traditionally been limited to a several line summary of documents from outside sources which have been placed in the paper file. There is no provision to capture electronically generated notes and to allow a summary to be included in the correspondence section.

Provide a post-project or post-expenditure (after implementation) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

Response:

Post-project process:

Parole and Work Release Orders and Agreements.

A. DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLE DECISIONS.

1. An inmate granted a parole is normally selected for interview at least 3 weeks before the interview. The decision to interview indicates a good chance of receiving a release. The decision to interview will be released by BOP on an institution basis after the interview rejections are posted, normally 3 weeks before the interview date. The interview list will be released electronically through ICON so that both the sending institutions and the receiving CBCs can access the list of interview candidates. This information will then allow CBCs to check the parole plan in advance of the BOP interview. BOP would send a simple email to all institutions and CBCs advising that a new interview list had been posted to ICON. This same information will be posted to the BOP web site not less than 48 hours after the decision is made and will be available for at least 90 days (instead of the current process of posting at the end of the month for one month).
2. When an inmate is denied release at screening, at interview or following, an electronic letter denying release would be generated by IPAROLE upon entry of the decision code and electronically made available in ICON to the counselor/treatment director/institution which would print a copy and deliver to the inmate. This information would also be posted to the BOP web site 3 days after the decision and be available for at least 90 days.
3. When a parole is approved, the BOP order for parole shall be issued electronically, which will have all conditions of release required by BOP, with a secure electronic signature and shall be posted to ICON in a read/print only format and thereby made available to the DOC facility holding the client. The document would also be available to Parole Officers (PO) and Community Based Corrections (CBC) through ICON.
4. Copies of Work Release decisions would be handled in the same manner.
5. The Board of Parole will print and mail, via. United States Postal Service (USPS), a letter to all registered victims advising them of the release decision. (No change from present system.) The system would be able to also send BOP victims the letter by email or fax.
6. The BOP order would be read only on ICON and IPAROLE Docket. In IPAROLE, the document could be obtained by clicking on a drop down menu while viewing that client's docket.
7. Because of the sensitive nature of parole and work release orders, they will require a secure means of authentication to guarantee security of the system.
8. The system must also allow for the printing in IPAROLE, and traditional ink signing of orders as a means of backup. These orders would print the bar codes to identify the inmate, document type and date and time printed to facilitate later scanning and indexing.

B. PAROLE and WORK RELEASE AGREEMENTS.

1. No longer will the parole agreement be printed at the BOP office and mailed to the institution where it is received in the mail room and routed to the appropriate person for processing. Before the inmate leaves the institution a counselor will print the Parole Agreement from ICON and both the inmate and warden (or designee) will sign the agreement.
2. Under this proposal, all language of the parole agreement, including the general conditions and special conditions, would continue to be set by the BOP. All components necessary to generate the Parole Agreement would be stored in IPAROLE and be read only in ICON with the exception that a PO (or supervisor) would be able to add or delete conditions from a list approved by BOP. In addition the PO (or supervisor) can remove the BOP condition of intense supervision without BOP permission.
3. When a release is approved, the IPAROLE system would choose the appropriate Parole Agreement form for the client and add the BOP required special parole or WR conditions. This would immediately be available for viewing and printing in the ICON system. Ideally the warden's designee or the PO and the client could "electronically sign" the document and save it to a location available to ICON and IPAROLE as a part of the client's file. At this time DOC has no procedure available to obtain the parolee's signature electronically. In the absence of the ability for the parolee to sign electronically, the PO would print out the agreement sign it and have the client sign it. The document would print with a bar code on the first page to identify the client, the form number and the date/time the agreement was printed. This process would first be followed at the prison when the parole agreement was signed by the parolee and the warden and later at the PO office in the field.
4. When the offender is released from prison he or she is required to report to the parole officer. The assigned Parole Officer (PO) will be able to review the parole conditions in ICON and may add more conditions to the parole agreement. The PO add the additional conditions in ICON and print a new agreement.
5. Preserving the agreement. The PO would either scan in the signed document or fax the signed

agreement to the ICON/IPAROLE computer would receive the image and index it based on the barcode. An "In Box" would be created within ICON to "hold" the image until it was indexed by the PO. Indexing would involve the PO checking in ICON to see that all pages were readable, that the automatic indexing worked properly and entering the date when the parole was signed by the client.

6. Amendments to Parole Agreement. Amendments to a parole agreement would be generated in a similar way, be electronically signed and preserved or printed, signed and faxed and preserved. When a new agreement is signed ICON and IPAROLE would display in an obvious way the existence of later agreements.

7. Removing Conditions. Conditions added by the PO and not required by BOP could be removed by the PO or their supervisor without BOP approval or by the BOP Chair or designee. PO presently has the authority to remove intense parole supervision (IPS) designation without BOP approval and this would not change. No other conditions on a parole may be removed except by the BOP Chair or the Chair's designee.

8. All changes in a Parole Agreement will be date/time stamped and a record maintained of who made the changes and when the document was printed.

9. Work Release agreements would be generated, signed, preserved and revised in the same manner as parole agreements.

Parole Revocation Applications.

A. CONTESTED PAROLE REVOCATION.

1. Under this proposal the Preliminary Parole Violation Information (PPVI) will be filled out on line by the PO using the ICON interface. The data elements necessary to create the PPVI will populate the IPAROLE database with the information to create a new parole revocation case. The PO can then print the Preliminary Parole Violation Information (PPVI) from a local printer and file it with the court. The PO would also have to enter the court filing and case number into ICON after the case was filed. Eventually the filing will be electronic when the court is capable of receiving electronic filings.

2. Individual parole violations would continue to be entered in ICON by parole officers as they occur. Under this proposal when a PPVI is filed, the PO would simply select all of the individual violation reports which would support the allegations in a Preliminary Parole Violation Information (PPVI) and electronically "attach" them to the PPVI so that all of these documents will be available as a unit in both ICON and IPAROLE.

If a judge or magistrate finds probable cause that a parole violation has occurred the judge or magistrate will issue an arrest warrant and the PO will be required to enter the warrant information in ICON, which will also be available in IPAROLE. When the court has the capability, these documents could be issued electronically, received by IPAROLE or ICON for viewing and printing.

2. Once submitted to the Court, the parole violation report data will become part of IPAROLE and will be read only in ICON. Amendments and supplemental reports will be allowed and filed in the same manner. A parolee may have more than one active Parole Violation Report. Multiple Supplemental Violation Reports may be submitted by the PO or the PO's supervisor in support of one or more PPVI.

3. The system will also maintain the calendar of all BOP Administrative Law Judges (ALJ) to facilitate assignment for hearings.

4. The BOP staff will daily generate a report in IPAROLE which will show a list of all filed PPVIs for which no hearing date has been set. The BOP hearing clerk will be able to click on one of the records, bring up the hearing input screen, review the documents in the file and enter case assignment information to assign the case to an ALJ and enter a hearing date. Scheduling Revocation Hearings would be automatically scheduled by the IPAROLE system based on a system where each ALJ would be assigned certain days and time for hearings. Many of the hearing dates would be limited to specific cities and some would be open to all with compressed video capability.

5. Notice of Hearing must be served on the parolee at least seven days before the hearing. The IPAROLE system would generate a notice when the case is assigned for hearing. The Notice would be available to be printed in ICON and the PO would normally personally serve the parolee by giving him or her a copy of the Notice and the PPVI. The PO would then complete and electronically sign a "Certificate of Service" within ICON which would be saved as an image in IPAROLE and populate the IPAROLE database showing when the parolee was served and what papers were served and by whom served.

6. Subpoenas would be issued and served by the PO similar to Notice of Hearing.

7. In Automatic Revocation cases (where client is sentenced to prison for two or more years on a new crime) the PO will electronically send or fax a copy of the county attorney's information and the Commitment Order to BOP to be captured in the image system and indexed to the inmate ICON number. This image will be available in both ICON and IPAROLE. Iowa Code sections 908.10 and .10A requires the

parolee receive a copy of this order along with notice parole has been revoked. A "Certificate of Service" similar to regular cases would be used.

8. Time Loss Calculation would automatically be calculated by the computer based on date the offense was committed and confirmed by the ALJ. This information is used by DOC to calculate the new tentative discharge date.

B. VOLUNTARY PAROLE REVOCATION.

1. BOP shall establish in IPAROLE a form accessible to parole officers and their supervisors through ICON to be used for voluntary termination of parole. When submitted by the PO the form will populate the Parole Revocation database in IPAROLE and the PO can print off the Voluntary Termination Agreement, which will have a bar code with the clients ICON number, date printed and form number.

2. The signed Voluntary Termination Agreement will be scanned and transmitted or faxed to the BOP where it will be indexed and attached to the client file and the database marked to reflect the receipt of the signed document.

3. The signed Voluntary Termination Agreement image will be available for viewing and printing in ICON and IPAROLE. The ALJ will issue an electronic order approving the Voluntary Termination Agreement and revoking the parole or work release. The PO will serve a copy Order revoking the parole on the parolee and complete the "Certificate of Service."

4. The ALJ will provide a copy of the revocation order to the sheriff, or other officer having custody of the parolee, to authorize transport back to prison. This may be done by fax from within IPAROLE or by either the ALJ or the PO attaching a copy of the ALJ order to an email or by printing and delivering.

C. PAROLE REVOCATION DECISIONS.

1. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) deciding parole revocation cases will enter the decision on the IPAROLE system which will affix an electronic signature. Because the ALJs sometimes travel and make decisions outside the BOP office they will each need to use a laptop computer in locations with access to the ICN computer network.

2, The ALJ's decision will be captured in the BOP database and the ALJ will have the option to email to multiple locations from within the application, fax to multiple locations from within the application and/or print the decision locally or remotely.

3. Decisions will be created from within IPAROLE only by the ALJ or the BOP Chair and they will be read and print only from within both IPAROLE and ICON once submitted. When viewing a decision which has been served more than 20 days prior to the time of viewing, or if an appeal has been denied and the appeal time has past, the computer view of the document would contain the statement "Final Decision." If an appeal is filed and not decided or if there is an appeal pending, when one views or prints the decision the statement "Appeal Pending" followed by the date of the appeal will also show. When the appeal has been decided the decision and date will also show when the decision is viewed or printed.

4. The PO will print a copy of the decision and serve it on the client. The PO will then complete a "Certificate of Service" in ICON and it will populate the IPAROLE database with service information.

Victim Registration

County attorneys would be allowed to register victims with both DOC and BOP by logging onto the BOP secure web site to enter victim registration information. This would also allow county attorneys to list and identify co-defendants. The system would allow a confirming mail, fax or email to be sent back to the registering attorney.

Recommendation Letters.

1. Trial judges and county attorneys are required by law to send letters of recommendation to the BOP, Iowa Code section 901.9. Under this proposal prosecuting attorneys and trial judges would have the option of logging on to a secure web site maintained by BOP to meet this statutory obligation. The information would be a combination of check boxes, drop down choices and fill in the blank as well as an option for an extended note. Access would be limited by user name and password and the system would allow BOP to send a confirming letter, fax or email back to the sender.

2. Defense attorneys, offenders, their family and supporters, victims of crime and the general public would be able to log onto the BOP web site and submit recommendations electronically which would be stored electronically in the BOP database with automatic indexing. Recommendations would require certain basic information and the program would not accept comments without the required information or if the offender could not be identified.

Receipt of Criminal History Information.

Criminal history information will be pushed electronically from Department of Public safety to BOP upon receipt of information from DOC that a prisoner has been admitted to prison or admitted to an OWI

treatment program. The information will be in electronic format which will tentatively populate the BOP database for the given offender. All such information must be confirmed by the BOP operator comparing the information to a second source of criminal history, FBI, pre sentence or reception report.

BOP Work Flow and Electronic Files.

1. Documents, typically support letters, received on paper may be scanned and documents received by fax or email may be received by the IPAROLE computer system and electronically stored.
2. Each document received in IPAROLE will be captured in an "In Basket" which will be cued up for the correspondence clerk to index the document using the IPAROLE correspondence form. The index will be to ICON #, document description and date signed.
3. Documents may be electronically routed to multiple BOP board and staff members by staff member who indexes the document. A priority may be assigned to each document.
4. A work-flow system would have an "In Box" for every BOP employee which would hold the list of unread documents and tasks to be preformed.
5. Multiple "Post-it" notes, with author initials and datestamp, can be attached to each document or to the file.
6. When any image is stored in the electronic storage area, the document can be viewed by clicking on the summary of that document when displayed in IPAROLE on the BOP "Docket."
6. Multi-page documents should be stored as a single document which the operator can scroll through page by page. The capability to "electronically staple" multiple pages into a single document must be included in the software.
7. Closed files could be scanned as time permits for long-term storage. This would save time for filing clerks and save the cost of purchasing additional file storage space.
9. The electronic file storage system would allow the images in a closed files to be moved to off-line storage.
10. Add a field for Board members to make confidential notes on file.
11. Add capability to enter staff or board detailed notes form conversation with a summary appearing on the docket.
12. Add a "list manager" which would allow the creation of multiple lists of offenders selected through various queries of the database for the purpose of making reports or generating docket books for release consideration. These lists would be in addition to the current review/interview lists. Each list so created would belong to the author and could be kept private or shared. The query and the date last updated would be part of each list maintained by the list manager.
13. Change the process of "staff recommended" releases by adding a screen to ICON where DOC staff would enter recommendations for staff initiated review by BOP. BOP would control the form and options and the information would be included in BOP dockets. This process would also generate a list of the list manager so it could be used for reviews and if selected for interview, the inmate would be added to the appropriate interview list for the institution holding the offender.

IPAROLE DOCKETS.

1. The BOP dockets to be modified to show the existence of images which can be viewed when summary is clicked.
2. Upgrade the display of LSI scores from ICON.
3. Add co-defendant (fall partners) table to connect parties to same crime.
4. Add to "on screen" docket an icon by counselor name which will open email addressed to that counselor and put inmate name and ICON number in subject line.
5. Print the "F-9" sheets in the order of hearing with all information except decision.
6. Provide for a BOP interview scheduling system to allow institutions limited access to the IPAROLE interview schedule so the treatment director or designee may schedule interviews by councilor, with certain restrictions and limitations.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).

G. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for this project. Include such items as planning, database design, coding, implementation, testing, conversion, parallel installation, and date of final release. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-2 points)
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (3-4 points)
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (5)

H. Funding Requirements

On a fiscal year basis, enter the estimated cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades, ...

| | FY06 | | FY07 | | FY08 | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| | Cost(\$) | % Total Cost | Cost (\$) | % Total Cost | Cost (\$) | % Total Cost |
| State General Fund | \$50,000 | 17% | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% |
| Pooled Tech. Fund /IowAccess Fund | \$250,000 | 83% | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% |
| Local Gov. Funds | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% |
| Grant or Private Funds | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% |
| Other Funds (Specify) | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% |
| Total Project Cost | \$300,000 | 100% | \$0 | 100% | \$0 | 100% |
| Non-Pooled Tech. Total | \$50,000 | 17% | \$0 | 0% | \$0 | 0% |

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points)

- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points)
 - The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10)
-

I. Scope

Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

☐ YES (If "YES", explain.) ☒ NO, it is a stand-alone project.

Explanation:

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

☐ YES (If "YES", explain.)

Explanation:

J. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology and/or IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

Response:

Of the total project cost of \$300,000, BOP will provide \$50,000 or 16.66% of the project cost through funding of current employee salaries for project planning, development of scope documents, testing, implementation and training.

Ongoing costs are projected to be \$20,000 in which will be used to correct errors found, make minor

adjustments to program functioning and changes as may be required by change in law or business practices of the courts, DOC, county attorneys and BOP.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)

Section II: Financial Analysis

A. Project Budget Table

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years. Additionally, the ROI calculation must include all new annual ongoing costs that are project related.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[\left(\frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

| Budget Line Items | Budget Amount (1st Year Cost) | Useful Life (Years) | % State Share | Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1st Year) | % State Share | Annual Prorated Cost |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Agency Staff | \$67,000 | 4 | 100.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$16,750 |
| Software | \$0 | 4 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 |
| Hardware | \$19,445 | 3 | 100.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$6,482 |
| Training | \$0 | 4 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 |
| Facilities | \$0 | 1 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 |
| Professional | \$213,555 | 4 | 100.00% | \$20,000 | 100.00% | \$73,389 |

| Services | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----|-------|----------|-------|----------|
| ITD Services | \$0 | 4 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 |
| Supplies, Maint, etc. | \$0 | 1 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 |
| Other | \$0 | 1 | 0.00% | \$0 | 0.00% | \$0 |
| Totals | \$300,000 | --- | --- | \$20,000 | --- | \$96,620 |

B. Spending Plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

Response:

This proposal will require additional hardware with an estimated cost of \$19,445: Laptop computers for each Administrative Law Judge (2 or 3). Scanner with auto feed for the BOP. Large monitors (21") for use with scanner for BOP. To index imaged documents Additional electronic storage space for ICON and IPAROLE. These items would be purchased in the fall or winter and the prices may decline from the estimate above. The exact specifications will be determined based on program and functional needs. Agency Staff – During the planning and design phases BOP will hire part-time staff to assist the staff members involved in the planning and design activities. For temporary help to work between 17 to 23 weeks it is estimated the salary and benefits will cost \$17,000. All key the Chair and Vice-chair and all BOP staff will be involved in developing the scope documents with computer programmers and all staff will be trained on the new system. All present employees of BOP will be paid through the BOP budget and no grant funds are requested for this purpose. Grant funds are requested for temporary supplemental help described in this paragraph.

C. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the ROI Financial Worksheet as necessary:

1. Annual Pre-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project implementation.

Describe Annual Pre-Project Cost:

The Pre-Project costs described here are costs which will go away as a result of successfully implementing this grant:

FTE SAVINGS

Trial Judge and County Attorney Recommendations.

Trail judges and county attorneys are each required to make letters of recommendation to the BOP for everyone sent to prison. In FY 04 preliminary figures indicate 3,400 criminals were sent to prison. The savings here arise from the judge or county attorney personally entering data on-line into the BOP computer system by suing a web site and avoiding the dictation, typing review and signing of the letter by the judge and county attorney and at BOP the reduction in opening and stamping the mail, entry of the letter into the BOP database and then filing the letter in the paper file. Calculations assume that each person sentenced to jail will receive a recommendation from the judge and county attorney. An recent unscientific survey indicates that less than 10% of prisoners receive these recommendations now. Savings are calculated as if these recommendations were all being prepared and submitted:

Judge/judicial employee savings:

3400 prisoners x 0.5 hours/prisoner x \$75/hr = \$127,500

County Attorneys savings:

3400 prisoners x 0.5 hours/prisoner x \$50/hr. = \$ 85,000

BOP Savings:

6800 letters received x. 0.2 hr/letter x 18.60/hr pay = \$ 25,296

Total Savings \$237,796

Parole Revocation Application Processing.

The grant will result in the eliminate ½ of a data entry person who costs the agency 38,000 per year for salary and benefits. This will be an annual savings of \$19,000. This person can then be reassigned to make BOP risk calculations.

Total FTE savings \$256,796

SUPPORT COST SAVINGS

Judge and county attorney postage expense savings:

3400 prisoners x 2 letters /prisoner x \$0.37/letter = \$2,516

OTHER COSTS

Reduction in Prison Costs/Increase in Prison Beds Available.

This proposal has the potential to generate significant on-going savings to the State of Iowa by speeding up the release of inmates approved for parole. Figures from CJJP indicate the BOP authorized release 2,849 prisoners who went to parole with supervision in Iowa during FY03. The FY04 numbers are not yet available. During the same period, 201 were discharged early by the BOP. If the average time from release authorization to the date the parolee walks out of prison can be reduced by 6 days through this program, we could empty the equivalent of more than 50 Iowa prison beds. With the current cost of operation for one prison bed at \$60.41 per day, the total operational savings would be in excess of One million dollars ANNUALLY.

$2,849 + 201 = 3050$ prisoners x 6 days/prisoner x 60.41/day = \$1,105,503

Making these 50 beds available will relieve the prison overcrowding problem.

3050 prisoners x 6 days/prisoner = 18,300 days beds empty

$18,300 / 365 = 50.1369$ beds/year empty

Quantify Annual Pre-Project Cost:

| | State Total |
|---|----------------|
| FTE Cost (salary plus benefits): | \$256,796.00 |
| Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.): | \$2,516.00 |
| Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.): | \$0.00 |
| Total Annual Pre-Project Cost: | \$1,364,815.00 |

2. Annual Post-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project implementation. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project implementation.

Describe Annual Post-Project Cost:

Describe Annual Post-Project Cost:

The Pre-Project costs listed above will be eliminated.

Quantify Annual Post-Project Cost:

| | State Total |
|---|------------------------|
| FTE Cost (salary plus benefits): | \$0.00 |
| Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.): | \$0.00 |
| Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.): | \$0.00 |
| Total Annual Post-Project Cost: | \$0.00 |

3. Citizen Benefit - Quantify the estimated annual value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on or waiting for the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

Describe savings justification:

Transaction Savings

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Number of annual online transactions: | 4,000 |
| Hours saved/transaction: | 1 |
| Number of Citizens affected: | 1 |
| Value of Citizen Hour | 10 |
| Total Transaction Savings: | \$40,000 |
| Other Savings (Describe) postage | \$1,480 |
| Total Savings: | \$41,480 |

4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss avoidance - Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

Response:

Response:

The primary benefit of this proposal is to make the operation of the parole process more efficient in the use of resources and speed the release of prisoners going to Iowa parole and discharge. While the Iowa prison population has grown from 3,842 inmates in 1990 to near 8,700 at the end of FY04 (at about 120% of capacity) the CJJP projects population at the end of FY2012 is 12,127, which would be 170% of capacity. The risk of allowing the population to reach higher levels is that federal law suits will order the state to take emergency action to reduce the population which might include sending prisoners to other state, building new prisons or releasing prisoners with high risks to reoffend. All of these options are expensive.

The greatest benefit to Iowa Citizens will be the reduction of prison population through shortening the

time between approval of parole and release from prison. This would have the effect of adding 50 beds to Iowa prisons. Several years ago it cost taxpayers \$35 million to construct a new prison to house 400 prisoners, or a cost of \$85,000 per prisoner. The cost of building a new prison to add 50 new beds would be \$4.3 million. This proposal would provide that additional capacity without new prison construction and therefore save taxpayers \$4.3 million..

A further benefit will be the ability of citizens to look on the BOP web site for recent decisions of the Board of Parole. Currently the decisions are not posted to the web site until the end of the month and at the end of the next month the decisions are replaced by new decisions. The delay in posting is frustrating to friends and family members of offenders so many of them call the BOP to inquire.

Allowing citizens to make comments to the BOP by email would obviously save each citizen the cost of postage. In a recent review of correspondence the BOP received an average of 36 letters per day from citizens concerning inmates. If 25% of them used email that would be an annual postage savings by the public of \$832.50 based on 2250 email messages sent per year at the current postage rate of 37 cents for first class postage.

The web site with the potential for interested citizens to find out when prisoners have been authorized. Ironically as I was working on this paragraph during the evening a working mother called hoping to leave a message to find out when her former husband, the father of her two adolescent children, would be release so that she could watch for him and get a restraining order. She had been frustrated that the BOP web site remains under construction (that is it does not work properly) and she could not find information about his recently authorized release. Having this web site up and running could save her at least one hour of time. If there were concerns about only one half of the 4862 releases authorized and if only one hour was saved for each of them, 2461 hours of citizen time could be saved with this internet access system.

5. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

The BOP is very interested in comments by prosecuting attorneys and trial judges. At the present time a significant number of attorneys and judges do not make comments. This proposal will make it much easier for them to provide timely comments which will increase the quality of decisions made by the board. Placing a monetary value on quality decision making is difficult.

| ROI Financial Worksheet | |
|---|-------------|
| A. Total Annual Pre-Project cost (State Share from Section II C1): | \$1,364,815 |
| B. Total Annual Post-Project cost (State Share from Section II C2): | \$0 |
| State Government Benefit (= A-B): | \$1,364,815 |
| Annual Benefit Summary: | \$1,364,815 |
| State Government Benefit: | \$1,364,815 |
| Citizen Benefit: | \$41,480 |
| Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit: | \$300,000 |

| | |
|--|-------------|
| C. Total Annual Project Benefit: | \$1,706,295 |
| D. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table): | \$96,620 |
| Benefit / Cost Ratio: (C/D) = | 17.66 |
| Return On Investment (ROI): ((C-D) / Requested Project Funds) * 100 = | 643.87% |

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Evaluation (25 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-8 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (9-16 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (17-25).

Note: For projects where no State Government Benefit, Citizen Benefit, or Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit is created due to the nature of the project, the Benefit/Cost Ratio and Return on Investment values are set to Zero.

Appendix A. Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after implementation and identify how they will be measured.

1. Improved customer service

Number of trial judges and county attorneys providing recommendations to BOP. To be measured by IPAROLE report.

Count the number of recommendations made through the web site.

2. Citizen impact

Number of visitors to BOP web site. To be measured by web host.

Count the number of recommendations made through the web site.

3. Cost Savings

Average length of time inmates stay in prison after released to Iowa parole or to discharge. To be measured by report in IPAROLE.

Count the number of recommendations made through the web site.

Count the number of BOP cases considered and compare to prior years, to calculate the average cost per case considered under the BOP budget. Use IPAROLE report and BOP budget.

4. Project reengineering

Observe if electronically issued parole and work release orders are issued as described.

Observe if POs are able to enter parole revocation application directly into IPAROLE to populate that database.

Observe if victim registration can be done electronically and count the number of registrations on line.

Observe if criminal justice information can be received by BOP electronically and count the number so received.

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

Use BOP budget to determine source of funds.

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

Return